MEMORANDUM

NATIONAL POLICY CONSENSUS CENTER
Hatfield School Of Government

TO: Mid-Coast IR TMDL Sediment Technical Working Group Members
FROM: Peter Harkema, Oregon Consensus (OC)
SUBJECT: DRAFT – Action Items from January 23 Meeting – DRAFT
DATE: February 4, 2013

This memo follows up on the January 23, 2013, meeting of the Mid-Coast Implementation Ready Total Maximum Daily Load (IR TMDL) Sediment Technical Working Group (TWG), held at the Siuslaw Valley Fire and Rescue, Florence, Oregon. The memo includes the following: proposed future meeting dates, identified action items and brief summaries of key topics discussed.

Upcoming Meetings
Please take note and calendar the following meetings.

Meeting	Date	Location
Bacteria TWG meeting	February 14, 2013	Lincoln City/Devils Lake Water Improvement District
LSAC Meeting 8	February 20, 2013	Oregon Coast Community College Newport
Temperature and Sediment TWG meetings	March 20, 2013 *(Temperature tentative)*	*TBD*
LSAC Meetings 9 - 14 *TWG Meetings*	*April 2013 – November 2013 (see current Projected Meeting Schedule)*	*TBD*

Action Items

Action Item	Who	Date
1. Action Items • Prepare draft Action Items memo and distribute to TWG members for review	OC (Peter) with DEQ	Complete
2. Information Follow-up • Post presentations and meeting documents, including full DOGAMI landslide report, to project website	DEQ	ASAP

3. Source Assessment Literature Submission • Submit additional literature to be considered in DEQ sediment source assessment literature review	TWG members	By COB February 22, 2013
4. Biocriteria Methodology Discussion • Resend list of questions via email • Schedule call to discuss details of biocriteria methodology	DEQ (David W.) with OC DEQ (David W. - lead), Kami, Jeff Light, Stephen, Stan, Glen, Mike, and (tentatively) Stacy Polkowske, and others as interested	By COB January 30 In advance of March 20 meeting
5. Feedback on Draft Roads Approach • Send Word version of "Roads Integration" document along with a description of requested feedback areas • Submit feedback using "reply all" via track changes • Request updates on ongoing forest/agriculture/public roads efforts	Josh S. Sediment TWG members Interested Sediment TWG members to Josh	Complete By COB on Feb 22nd, 2013 Ongoing

Sediment TWG Members Present: Stephen Hager (Siuslaw Watershed Council), Mike Buren (ODF), Kate Danks (NRCS), Hui Rodomsky (Salmon-Drift Creek Watershed Council), Wayne Hoffman (MidCoast Watersheds Council), Randy Hereford (Starker Forests), Kami Ellingson (USFS), Richard Huff (private landowner), Peter Adams (BLM), Glen Spain (PCFFA), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA Fisheries – alternate for Dan Avery)

Project Team Members Present: David Waltz, Ryan Michie, Gene Foster, Karen Tarnow, Josh Seeds, Zach Loboy (DEQ); Alan Henning, Helen Rueda (EPA); Turner Odell, Jessie Conover (Oregon Consensus)

Other Attendees: Jim Welsh (Oregon Cattlemen's Association), Gary Springer (Starker Forests), Mary Scurlock (M. Scurlock & Associates), Paul Engelmeyer (TWG/NFS), Kyle Abraham (ODF), Steve Steiner (Eugene BLM), Mike Totey (ODF), Bill Burns (DOGAMI), Greg Haller (Pacific Rivers Council), Josh Lambert (Lincoln SWCD), Ray Kinney (Siuslaw SWCD)

Facilitation: Peter Harkema (Oregon Consensus)

Meeting Notes

Key topics and themes:

During the fifth meeting of the Mid-Coast TMDL Sediment TWG, attendees: (1) heard updates to the temperature litigation, CZARA litigation and Mid-Coast TMDL LSAC/TWG meeting schedule (2) heard and discussed the DOGAMI landslide inventory presentation (3) heard and discussed the current draft of the integration (cover) section of the roads approach and request for feedback. The meeting agenda, meeting materials (including PowerPoint presentations) will be available through the DEQ Mid-Coast TMDL project website at: (http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/tmdls/midcoast.htm).

Stakeholder Questions, Issues, Concerns and Agency Responses

Updates and litigation update

Gene Foster updated the group on the current schedule for the temperature litigation lawsuit. He expects that temperature rulemaking will occur after the judge makes a decision, but there is a period of uncertainty until then. The Temperature TWG had a discussion about the potential implications of various temperature litigation outcomes. On the topic of the CZARA lawsuit, DEQ is having internal conversations to determine what TMDL activities are feasible to accomplish in the settlement agreement timeline, whether more time might be needed, and which work will proceed in light of ongoing developments and staff capacity.

A TWG member asked about the December EPA/NOAA letter to the Court on the status of the Settlement Agreement, and whether the 2021 dates refers to TMDL development or implementation. DEQ's understanding is that 2021 refers to an issuance date for TMDLs in all basins within the coastal nonpoint management area.

David Waltz (DEQ) reviewed outstanding Sediment TWG action items. Regarding the sediment source assessment call for literature, DEQ has only received 8-10 publications and an unpublished memorandum. The technical staff is looking at the sediment source assessment and requests that TWG members submit literature materials review in the next 30 days. DEQ noted that it had not received responses or feedback on the reference site information request email that they sent out and would like those loose ends to be tied up in next 30-60 days.

Discussion topics, included:

- How TWG members could be assured that the information they submit will be integrated into the TMDL. DEQ explained that initially there was a perception that only roads and landslides would be considered as potential sources in the sediment analysis. They requested that if people had information about other potential sources of sediment, they should submit them as part of the call for information. That information will be considered by staff as part of a comprehensive sediment literature review. Additional information on potential sources and related physical and ecological processes is also welcome as a contribution towards the literature review.
- Some participants expected a detailed, "nuts and bolts" discussion of the biocriteria assessment method for interested parties. Some stakeholders perceived the DEQ call for questions to be more about reference sites and not the details about the biocriteria methodology, which may explain why there was so little feedback. DEQ will set up a meeting/conference call for who expressed interest in having a more detailed discussion about the biocriteria methodology and how assessment progresses to impairments and 303(d) listings. Current biocriteria discussion group list: Kami, Jeff, Steven, Stan, Glen, Mike, and tentatively Stacy. If others are interested in taking part in the discussion they should contact David or Ryan.

A TWG member informed the group that there may be issues with sediment discharge from rock quarries in unlisted areas. They referred to Ekman Creek (Alsea) and Cedar Creek (Siletz). DEQ noted that those sources probably hold 1200-A NPDES permits administered by DOGAMI, and staff will follow-up.

Landslide Inventory Presentation and Discussion

Ryan Michie (DEQ) introduced Bill Burns from the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI). The talk focused on deep-seated landslides; the March meeting will address shallow landslides. Bill covered an introduction to LiDAR, "Landslides 101," and specific landslide findings in the Mid-Coast.

Bill and his colleagues conducted a landslide inventory in two Mid-Coast fifth field watersheds. The findings can be found in the report titled "LiDAR data and landslide inventory maps of the North Fork Siuslaw River and Big Elk Creek Watersheds, Lane, Lincoln, and Benton Counties, Oregon" and will be made available.

Landslide inventory results will be placed into Statewide Landslide Information Database of Oregon (SLIDO). In the North Fork Siuslaw the authors found a very high number of landslides covering 26% of the watershed.

Answers to Clarifying Questions on the North Fork Siuslaw results:

- Do each of the debris flow fans have a signal indicating their origination location?
    - The fan information is probably an accumulation of multiple events. Estimating where fan deposits came from will be a topic at the shallow landslide meeting in March.
- Can the landslide information be linked to earthquake events?
    - The report doesn't address it, but it would be a great study.
- Do you have an idea of when historically active landslides were initiated?
    - We have date info on some of them, but not all of them.
- No attributes about the vegetation were recorded.

The Big Elk Creek results showed a higher number of landslides covering 37% of the watershed. See the slide presentation or report for more detailed results.

General Questions/Discussion for Bill Burns:

- How do these watersheds compare to others?
    - They aren't unusual; landslides are common in the coastal zone. The authors were surprised at how many landslides are historic (recent). The geology is relatively weak, combined with earthquakes, steep slopes, and frequent or intense rainfall.
- Can you talk about vegetation change and roads on slopes?
    - The study didn't compare landslides to vegetation change or roads on slopes. Bill recommend looking at studies done on those topics [such as ODF's study on 1996 storm impacts]. It is difficult when landslides don't have exact dates because you have to match them to when vegetation removal/road events have occurred.
- Is it possible to date landslides using molecular (or other) methods?
    - It might not be helpful, even without money constraints. It might be worth conducting site-specific studies (drilling and doing stability analysis), but that still might not improve understanding significantly.
- Has this been tied in with topographic deep landslide work at U of O (i.e., Roering method)?
    - Yes, but not that successful because the fans are smooth features on flat ground.
- How can you tell how old the landslide is?
    - Photo comparison, old studies sometimes have dates, and calibration of what an historic landslide looks like in a particular area.

Ryan spoke about how the deep-seated information will be used in the TMDL process. He explained that the next step is to assess characteristics of shallow landslides and map those susceptible areas. DEQ is working with ODF and DOGAMI using shallow landslide inventory data from 1996-97. DEQ is identifying susceptible areas using a geomorphic approach and GIS to classify slope and slope form. DEQ will present the methodology at a future TWG meeting when the analysis is further along.. The flow chart in the meeting materials shows where in the workflow this process is situated:

1. Literature review (including submissions from TWG)
2. Conceptual model (basis of potential sources in sediment source analysis)
3. Analytical exercise (use physical and biological data that DEQ has collected to form a picture of the attributes upstream of various monitoring stations; and examine relationships between biological and physical attributes)

Together these items will form the basis of the TMDL source assessment and linkage analysis.

Roads Approach Update Presentation and Discussion

Josh Seeds (DEQ) presented an update on the Roads Approach. The presentation, titled "Sediment Technical Working Group Roads Approach Update," is available on the project website. Josh briefly walked the group through the draft roads integration document, which will serve as the cover piece to the agricultural roads, forest roads, and public roads components. He noted that the integration document would be distributed after the meeting to TWG members for review and comment. All suggestions are welcome but Josh noted that the following areas would be particularly useful in document development.

Road Network Goals and Objectives
  - Are the Goals & Objectives understandable and clearly descriptive of what information is needed and what the roads approach should accomplish when implemented?
  - Do you have concerns or modifications to suggest?
  - Which Goals and/or Objectives need to be spelled out in detail in the sector-based approach?
- Components
  - Are the basic Components understandable?
  - Are there additional needed Components, and what are they?
  - Are any Components superfluous and unneeded for improving outcomes and why?
  - Which Components need to be spelled out in detail in the sector-based approaches?
- Timeline & Milestones
  - Are the milestones achievable in this time frame, and do they balance water quality restoration and economic considerations? If not, how would you modify the timeline or milestone and why?
- Ambiguous responsibility
  - Are the identified ambiguous cases assigned to the appropriate sector approach? If not, how should they be dealt with?
  - Are there additional areas of ambiguity that need to be addressed, and how should they be addressed?
- Other suggestions or comments?

Discussion topics, included:
- How will baseline road conditions for private forest road be collected?
  - DEQ isn't asking for a database of private road information, rather they are looking for a summary. Baseline can be current road conditions or pre-Oregon Plan roads conditions.
- Can ODA determine that they will cover rural residential driveways?
  - DEQ's understanding is that rural residential driveways are covered under ODA rules/statutes.
- With regard to local access roads, there was a brief discussion about road owners associations and special road districts and where they might fit into implementation.
- Josh will circulate the draft roads integration document for TWG review, and the individual sector approaches to each of the subgroups.

Josh requested that TWG members please submit feedback on the Integration document by COB on February 22nd. Please provide in reply-all email format to Sediment TWG list. Feedback could be in the body of a reply email or as track changes in an attached Word document. (Note: Josh sent Word files of the draft approach and the list of topics for feedback on 1/29/2013)

General Updates
Lincoln SWCD is preparing a Section 319 grant application to do an agricultural roads assessment in the Big Elk Creek watershed. . The Mid-Coast Watersheds Council submitted an OWEB Technical Assistance grant application to work with local partners to conduct an assessment of the public roads network in the Big Elk Creek watershed.